In re: Eral Foxenland

Application Serial No.: 10/553,369 Filing Date: October 17, 2005

Page 8 of 9

## **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the through examination of the present application as evidenced by the Official Action of December 20, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action). In particular, Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 6-11 and 17-22.

Applicants wish to note, however, that the rejections set forth in the Office Action appear to be based on Claims 1-27 as set forth in published PCT application WO 2004/097616, rather than on Claims 1-23 as set forth in Applicants' Preliminary Amendment submitted concurrently with the filing of the present application, which appears in PAIR as received by the USPTO on October 17, 2005. The amendments to the claims provided in Applicants' Preliminary Amendment were based on the claims as amended in response to the International Preliminary Report on Patentability (IPRP) of July 25, 2005, which was also submitted with the filing of the present application and appears in PAIR as having a mail room date of October 17, 2005.

Accordingly, Applicants submit the present amendment (which includes claim amendments based on the claims as amended in response to the IPRP and corresponding to Applicants' Preliminary Amendment of October 17, 2005) for consideration by the Examiner. Applicants note that independent Claim 1 as amended corresponds to Claim 6 of the published PCT application, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. In particular, Claim 1 as amended recites, in part, "detecting a scrolling action selection" by actuation of a first user input unit "configured to be actuated in a first direction and a second direction opposite the first direction", "detecting a scrolling speed variation selection" by actuation of a second user input unit "configured to be actuated in the first and the second directions", and "increasing the scrolling speed if the scrolling action selection and the scrolling speed variation selection correspond to a same direction, and decreasing the scrolling speed if the scrolling action selection and the scrolling speed variation selection correspond to opposite directions". As noted in the Office Action, the cited reference to Sharp (WO 01/28197) fails to disclose or suggest at least these recitations. See Office Action, Page 5. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 as amended is patentable for at least the reasons discussed in the Office Action with reference to Claim 6 of the

In re: Eral Foxenland

Application Serial No.: 10/553,369 Filing Date: October 17, 2005

Page 9 of 9

published PCT application. Also, Claims 2-9 are patentable at least per the patentability of Claim 1 from which they depend.

Similarly, independent Claim 10 as amended corresponds to Claim 17 of the published PCT application, which the Examiner has also indicated as allowable. In particular, Claim 10 as amended recites, in part, "a control unit configured to...detect the scrolling action selection by a user responsive to actuation of said first user input unit, detect the scrolling speed variation selection responsive to actuation of said second user input unit", "provide a scrolling speed increase if the scrolling action selection and the scrolling speed variation selection correspond to a same direction", and "provide a scrolling speed decrease if the scrolling action selection and the scrolling speed variation selection correspond to opposite directions. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 10 as amended is patentable for at least the reasons discussed in the Office Action with reference to Claim 17 of the published PCT application. *See* Office Action, Page 5. Also, Claims 11-23 are patentable at least per the patentability of Claim 10 from which they depend.

Accordingly, in light of the amendments and discussion presented above, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,

Rohan G. Sabapathypillai Registration No. 51,074

USPTO Customer No. 54414

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec Post Office Box 37428

Raleigh, North Carolina 27627 Telephone: 919/854-1400

Facsimile: 919/854-1400

## CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 5, 2007.

Betty-Lou Rosser